

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m-)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/053,014	_	10/16/2001	Andrew Frumovitz	AFRUM.002A	8697	
20995	7590	02/24/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE	MARTE	NS OLSON & BEA	AR LLP	BONDERER	, DAVID A	
2040 MAIN FOURTEEN				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, C	A 92614	1		3732	17	
				DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		A	01
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/053,014	FRUMOVITZ ET AL.	
navioury name	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	D. Austin Bonderer	3732	
The MAILING DATE of this communicati	ion appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	·
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2004 FAILS TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is requing inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be examination for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice (Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1	ired to avoid abandonment of the either: (1) a timely filed amendn of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (nis application. A proper reply to nent which places the application	o a on in
PERIOD I	FOR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from th b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REF 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a)	of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date sel ire later than SIX MONTHS from the mai PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH I). The date on which the petition under 3	ling date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See M 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate exte	MPEP
ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the perion 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	shortened statutory period for reply origing in three months after the mailing date of the	nally set in the final Office action; or (2) a ne final rejection, even if timely filed, may	s set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof 			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be er	ntered because:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would requ	ire further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (se	e Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	lication in better form for appea	I by materially reducing or simp	olifying the
(d) they present additional claims withou	t canceling a corresponding nu	mber of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			٠
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the followi			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	_ would be allowable if submitter.	ed in a separate, timely filed an	nendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ reapplication in condition for allowance became.		een considered but does NOT p	olace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consid raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		SOLELY to issues which were r	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed ame explanation of how the new or amended of	endment(s) a) will not be enterlaims would be rejected is prov	ered or b)⊠ will be entered and ided below or appended.	l an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as	follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-41</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a		oved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure			
10. ☐ Other:	PEDRO PHILOGENE		



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Perez in view of Smith anticipates the claims. Perez teaches the use of a Speculum with a longer blade on the bottom to contact lower part of the vagina. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to turn it over while still using the teaching that the longer blade is to contact the lower part of the vagina. However, the claims where rejected in view of the teachings of Smith. So in the alternative Smith teaches having the handle on the opposite side of the longest blade not just the angling of the handle in reference to the blades. In addition, the claimed method of use of a vaginal speculum in an OBGYN setting is an obvious variant of the structure anticipated by Perez in view of Smith.

PEDRO PHILOGENE PRIMARY EXAMINER